

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/071,314	HELBER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Venkataraman Balasubramanian	1624	

**All Participants:**

(1) Venkataraman Balasubramanian.

(2) Sarah Meeks Roberts.

**Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 23 February 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

1-13

Claims discussed:

1-13

Prior art documents discussed:

*Davis et al.*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:  
Cancellation of non elected subject matter and inadvertent omission of proviso of D definition in claim 8 and therefore applicability of Davis et al. were discussed. Applicants authorized to limit X and X1 to sulfone and Y and Y1 to carbonyl cancel claim 3 and add the proviso that D is not a hemicyanine moiety in claim 8. Such will be done by examiner's amendment.